Sites of Performance and Circulation

Rosa Andújar

[in *A Cultural History of Tragedy in Antiquity*, ed. Emily Wilson (Bloomsbury)]

It is a truth universally acknowledged that tragedy was born in classical Athens. For most of the fifth century BC it was an exclusively Athenian phenomenon, performed in the Theatre of Dionysus on the southern slope of the Acropolis during festivals honoring the god.[1] Its connection to the Athenian democracy, which also flourished in the fifth century, is similarly widely recognized: since the publication of the essays in *Nothing to do with Dionysos?* in 1990,[2] tragedy has been defined as an Athenian civic and political spectacle, one that furthermore wielded an enormous impact on Athens' citizenry.[3] The rudiments of this story are well known. The festivals at which drama was performed were not only fixed items in the city's annual calendar, but they were also elaborate multi-day events in which all official business was suspended. Their organization and financing formed a fundamental part of the public service institution of *leitourgia*. Each year, the city's eponymous archon appointed six wealthy Athenian citizens to serve as *chorēgoi*, responsible for funding the choruses for each of the three tragic and three comic playwrights that would compete in the upcoming Great Dionysia festival. This task, *chorēgia*, was considered a major civic duty in Athens, on a par with paying for a troop of soldiers or equipping a trireme.[4]

Despite its origins as an Athenian invention and civic occasion, tragedy quickly became 'Greek', spreading to other venues beyond Attica as early as the fifth century BC, including many across the Mediterranean, from Sicily to the Black Sea.[5] In this chapter, it is not my aim to give a comprehensive account of how and where tragedy spread or the process through which it was transformed into an international and Panhellenic art form; such an

account merits several tomes at the very least.[6] Instead, I outline certain key moments in the early performance and cultural history of tragedy, focusing on particular events in its circulation that led to its rapid rise to importance in Greek and Roman cultural and political life. These moments correspond to two general parts, which likewise structure the chapter: the first relating to various venues in which it was performed across the ancient Greek world and the second to its larger cultural import in Rome. In exploring these contexts, I argue that we should rethink what counts as a site of performance beyond literal theatrical spaces and instead consider the myriad places in which tragedy re-emerges.

The first part exploring tragedy in Greek antiquity contains three sections: in the first, I examine two autocratic contexts in the fifth century BC which are crucial in considering the early and wide spread of Athenian tragedy: Sicily and Macedon, particularly focusing on the production of Aeschylus' *Women of Aetna* (and the likely re-performance of *Persians*) under the tyrant Hieron and of Euripides' *Archelaus* at the court of the Macedonian king. In both cases I am interested in tragedy's portability beyond Athens and its production under the aegis of powerful patrons. My second section develops this account of tragedy's production in non-democratic contexts, as it considers the manner in which tragedy was embraced by Alexander the Great and other Hellenistic monarchs as part of Panhellenic cultural programs, a phenomenon that further detached tragedy from its Athenian, civic, and religious roots. The third and final section concludes with a brief look at tragedy's continued performance in the Hellenistic period, but this time in the context of two 'democracies', Cos and Rhodes, independent islands whose cities appear to have adopted various aspects of the festival and choregic framework of fifth-century Athens in which tragedy initially flourished. As I illustrate, both islands' connections to Alexandria and to other points in the eastern

Mediterranean, as well as their alliances with Rome, suggest that they were critical sites for the further production and dissemination of tragedy.

The second part of the chapter moves from a literal exploration of 'sites of performance and circulation' to a broader consideration of the primary and especially secondary receptions of Greek tragedy, examining aspects of the cultural and literary reception of tragedy in the Roman Republic and Empire. After a brief initial consideration of the Roman development of the genre as well as the complex nature of Roman receptions of Greek tragedy, I focus on two specific examples which I argue should be read not merely as reception of tragedy but as sites of re-performance in their own right: tragedy's role in Roman philosophy and in the emerging genre of prose fiction. In the first I examine the manner in which Cicero incorporates translated quotations from Greek and Roman tragedy in his philosophical dialogues, using tragedy as shorthand for emotion. In the second, I discuss evocations of Greek tragedy in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. These two case studies illustrate the wide-ranging nature of the conceptualization and impact of tragedy in the Roman Republic and later Empire. My overall aim is to demonstrate the wider complex circulation of tragedy in antiquity as well as the routes by means of which, and frameworks within which, it took place.

I. Ancient Greek World

a. Tragedy in fifth-century Autocracies

As early as the fifth century BC, various accounts report tragic performances occurring outside Attica, and under the sponsorship of tyrants.[7] The biographical traditions of two of

Athens' greatest playwrights, for instance, include reports of travel beyond the city: Aeschylus visited the island of Sicily, and Euripides spent time in Macedon.[8] In both places, these representatives of this 'democratic' art were based at the court of autocrats: they not only accepted the patronage of these rulers, but the poets also composed new tragedies that celebrated the exploits of these monarchs. Given the lack of evidence regarding the poets' time at these courts, or even regarding their respective decisions to accept foreign commissions in the first place, my approach here is to provide a brief review of the evidence available about these visits to illustrate tragedy's early appeal to a non-Athenian audience. In my consideration of the circulation of Athenian tragedy in both Sicily and Macedon, my focus is on tragedy's immediate potential as both an export and a tool for propaganda. As I show, autocrats, particularly those on the periphery of the Greek world, sought to link themselves to Athens and to the wider Greek world specifically through tragedy.

Aeschylus in Sicily

In a passage describing the Palici gods of Sicily, the late antique writer Macrobius reports that their presence in literature is first attested in the work of Aeschylus, who, in his words, was, 'a truly Sicilian man' (*vir utique Siculus*, *Sat*. 5.19.17).[9] This intimate association between Aeschylus and Sicily that the Roman readily suggests might seem outlandish, were it not for the fourteen different sources which report that Aeschylus left Athens at least once in order to visit Sicily at the invitation of the tyrant Hieron.[10] The *Life of Aeschylus* 9 (=*TrGF*^{3} T1.33-4) specifically links his visit with the production of a new play, *Women of Aetna*, composed in honor of Hieron's founding of the city (476/5 BC). Specifically, it states that for the new inhabitants the play was 'to be regarded as an omen of good life' (*oiōnizomenos bion agathon*). The language employed here clearly indicates that the play was

meant to celebrate the recent establishment of the city, which was a fundamental part of Hieron's colonialist enterprise.[11] According to the first-century BC historian Diodorus, Hieron's founding of Aetna in 476 BC was a bloody affair, since Hieron founded the new city by driving out Naxians and Catanians and then importing his own people.[12] Seen in this context, Aeschylus' composition of *Women of Aetna* immediately raises difficult questions that not only challenge our perception of the Athenian poet but also forces us to think about tragedy's role in a non-Athenian venue.

Unfortunately, the plays murky remains provide no answers to these questions and in fact compound the difficulties around this play, making it difficult to answer the tantalizing questions that are raised by the little about which we do know: why would the author of a play such as *Persians,* which ultimately celebrated the victory of Greece against an invading army, accept a commission to praise a colonialist enterprise involving the occupation of a city?[13] Similarly, why would Hieron wish to celebrate his new city by means of a foreign genre? Finally, how was tragedy received on Sicilian soil? Not much is known regarding the characters of the play or even its basic plot. Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.19.16-31) suggests that the story involved a nymph of mount Aetna named Thaleia who was impregnated by Zeus. However, given the circumstances around the foundation of this new city, scholars surmise that the play's central myth 'had to be invented more or less *ex novo*'.[14] The evidence provided by Macrobius additionally includes a four-line fragmentary dialogue between two speakers that discusses a new genealogy for the Palici gods of Sicily; scholars assume as a result of this brief exchange that the play to some extent Hellenizes Sicilian life.[15] Based on this internal evidence, it therefore appears that Aeschylus stretches Greek mythical narratives in order to accommodate Sicilian characters, such as its autochthonous gods, and its traditions. Other surviving testimonies furthermore raise crucial questions regarding Sicilian

stagecraft. The fragmentary hypothesis of the play, which survives on a papyrus (*P.Oxy.* 2257 fr. 1 = *TrGF*[3] 126-7), reveals that it had an impressive number of scene changes involving five locations across Sicily, including Aetna, Leontini and Syracuse.[16] That a tragedy at this early historical point could feature so many scenic changes has been a revelation to scholars, casting doubts about the realities of performance and in particular the technology of tragedy available in Sicily.[17] One item of speculation concerns the chorus, specifically whether, to allow for so many scene changes, the group would be less defined as a character in this play, present on stage simply as a general collective rather than possessing a specific identity that anchors them to the dramatic plot.[18] The suggestion that the *mēchanē* was used, potentially in a scene featuring the abduction of Thalia, intriguingly suggests that theaters outside Athens may have also had sophisticated equipment at their disposal.[19]

Regardless of the uncertainties surrounding the plot and stage effects of *Women of Aetna*, further evidence links a second Sicilian visit by Aeschylus to the performance of yet another play. *The Life of Aeschylus* 18 (=*TrGF*[3] T1.37) states that Hieron gave Aeschylus the honor of staging a performance of *Persians* in Sicily. Scholars believe that this event occurred most likely around 470, two years after the play's Athenian premiere.[20] If their assumption is correct, then this would be the earliest re-performance of any Athenian tragedy, and quite possibly one of the only few occurring in the fifth century.[21] Scholars have speculated on the larger significance of such a re-performance, particularly in a relatively foreign context. Why would such a play be restaged on Sicilian soil? Oliver Taplin suggests one possible solution, namely, that *Persians* was a vital part of the 'celebration culture of the 470s' which commemorated and communicated the victories against the Persians to a broad audience of Greeks, which crucially included those beyond the mainland.[22] These victories, as he posits, led to a general sense of, and aspiration towards, 'coherent Hellenicity'.[23] It may

additionally be the case that such a victory would have had particular resonance and relevance in Sicily. Citing Herodotus, who claims that the Sicilians' defeat of Carthage at Himera occurred on the very same day that Athens destroyed the Persians at Salamis, Rush Rehm discusses the 'synchronicity of greatness' that connected Athens and Syracuse.[24] If this is true, the performance of *Persians* would have effectively connected and reframed Hieron's victories in wider Panhellenic terms. Moreover, if we link this act of Panhellenic reframing to the performance of *Women of Aetna,* which similarly Hellenized important aspects of Sicilian life, we can clearly see tragedy's potential as a sort of Panhellenic telescope, able to focus and bring to light what was previously thought as foreign and far away.

Aeschylus' visit or visits to Hieron's court thus marked a crucial event both for the history of tragedy and that of the tragedian, who undertook a further visit there, ultimately dying at Gela.[25] The fact that that Aeschylus paid perhaps three visits to the island reveals that Sicily was an early and important site of circulation in the cultural history of tragedy in antiquity.[26] It must be acknowledged, however, that Aeschylus was not the first tragic poet to visit Sicily: various sources suggest that Phrynichus the tragedian had been there previously, and it is likely that Aeschylus may have been following in his footsteps.[27] If these sources are correct, then it would appear that Sicily was already in the early fifth century BC a recognized venue for the performance of tragedy, with an audience that would have been already receptive to the genre. This is certainly the case by the end of the century: in *the Life of Nicias* 29.2, the biographer Plutarch recounts the story of Athenians imprisoned on the island after the failed Sicilian expedition who were freed by their Sicilian captors simply because they recited excerpts from Euripides' plays. A scholiast on Aristotle's *Rhetorica* later elaborated on this story, stating that Euripides himself was sent to Syracuse to negotiate the release of his fellow imprisoned Athenians.[28] Regardless of whether Euripides did visit or

not, scholars of early Sicilian theatre unanimously agree that Athenian tragedy's impact was enormous on the development of theatre on the island.[29] Enthusiasm for Athenian theatre continued well into the fourth century, and especially as a genre that was sponsored by autocrats: the ruler Dionysius I of Syracuse, who reportedly bought Euripides' harp, pen, and tablet from the poet's heirs, himself produced many tragedies in Athens before winning first place himself at the Lenaea festival of 367 BC with a play entitled the *Ransom of Hector*.[30] It cannot be doubted that Aeschylus' presence must have been a major catalyst for this continued interest in and enthusiasm for tragedy, perhaps even helping with the eventual spread of Athenian theatre to South Italy.[31] From its early days, then, we can see that tragedy's appeal was broad and international, reaching the farthest extremes of the Greek west, from where it would travel to Rome.

Euripides in Macedon

The biographical accounts of Euripides' life similarly report that the poet spent time away from Athens, moving in his old age to Magnesia and Macedonia and spending some years there until his death in 406 BC.[32] As with his predecessor Aeschylus, Euripides was reportedly based at the court of an autocrat, Archelaus, and even wrote a play in his honor.[33] The anecdotes of his time in Macedon are plentiful and attested by a plethora of sources: for example, Aristotle mentions that Euripides flogged a certain Decamnichus who later plotted against Archelaus (*Pol*. 1311b30), Plutarch mentions a famous cup that Archelaus gifted him (*Mor.* 177a, 531d-e), and the late antique writer Diomedes Grammaticus states that the poet taught an ignorant Archelaus about tragedy (Diom. 488). There are further stories relating to his death and how Athenian delegates traveled to Macedon in order to claim his remains (Gell. *NA* 15.20.9-10).[34] While we may debate the reliability of anecdotes as a source of

information, the evidence for both Euripides' presence in Macedon and his relationship to the tyrant is much more wide-ranging than those relating to Aeschylus' visits to Sicily. As a result, it cannot be doubted that tragedy seems to have especially thrived in Macedonian autocratic soil.[35]

Archelaus' reasons for inviting the Athenian poet to his court are clearer. It appears that in offering his patronage to Euripides, Archelaus was following in the philhellenic footsteps of his grandfather, Alexander I, who, in an effort to establish close ties with the wider Greek world after the Persian wars, had invited known poets such as Pindar and Bacchylides to his court, meaning that Macedon was already to some extent an established site for the performance of poetry.[36] Given that Greek sources from the classical period generally testify to a general sense of Macedonian 'otherness', such efforts to court Greek poets with an international reputation would have undoubtedly helped improve the Macedonian public image.[37] However, the fragments of the eponymous play that Euripides wrote for the ruler reveal that Archelaus was not interested in simply connecting with the rest of the Greek world by embracing its artistic trends, but rather that he himself sought to be recognized as a fellow Greek. One of the principal fragments of the *Archelaus* relates an impressive genealogy of the Macedonian royal family (*TrGF*[5.1] F 228). According to Eoghan Moloney, Euripides introduces two crucial elements to this geneaology: the poet identifies a mythical Archelaus responsible for founding the Macedonian royal line, and at the same time extends the legacy of the children of Heracles to Macedon by making Archelaus the son of Temenus.[38] The summary by Hyginus (*Fab.* 219) likewise mentions this new genealogy and illustrates the new connection to Heracles that the Macedonian kings now have as a result. In this manner, Euripides develops a prestigious Hellenic heroic lineage for this new mythical Archelaus, which extends to the contemporary Archelaus.[39] Annette Harder points out that

this echoes other evidence that similarly connects the Macedonian royal line to Heracles, such as Macedonian coins showing the head and attributes of Heracles.[40]

Whereas Aeschylus composed a myth *ex novo* to celebrate the exploits of Hieron and Sicilian life in general, here Euripides adapts existing mythical narratives about the children of Heracles in order to include contemporary Macedonians. Throughout his extant tragic corpus, the manner in which Euripides alters traditional myths to suit his dramatic needs is clear to see: for example, in *Medea* he assigns the death of her children to their mother, and not to the Corinthians, and he easily rewrites the role of Phaedra in the second (and surviving) version of *Hippolytus* so that she is no longer a shameless woman who propositions her stepson. While the freedom with which he adapts these myths is widely recognized, it appears in a new light when we encounter it in an alternative site of performance — the autocratic venue. If we consider the active and hostile tradition against Archelaus at the time, considerations of tragedy as autocratic propaganda become even more striking: according to Plato (*Grg*. 471), Archelaus was 'the greatest criminal', responsible for having killed three people. Perhaps to counter such condemnations, we can therefore speculate that the ruler sought help in elevating his name in the wider Greek speaking world, and what better and more effective way than through tragedy.[41] The *Life of Euripides* is not forthcoming on whether the poet composed the *Archelaus* in order to redeem the Macedonian patron in the eyes of the wider Greek world; it simply states that Euripides wished to 'please' (*charizomenos*) him.[42] Looking further ahead, however, we can see that tragedy was indeed an effective means of legitimization: a few decades after, Isocrates was able to praise Philip's direct connection to and descent from Heracles.[43] By the time of Alexander, the Macedonian royal line was clearly connected with Heracles, an association which the ruler regular

exploited.[44] Tragedy in this sense can be seen as part of a larger public relations strategy for the autocratic ruler, and as such a useful tool which can bring immediate results.

Despite the abundance of anecdotes about Euripides in Macedon, we do not know anything about the performance conditions at Philip's court, and specifically where the new play *Archelaus* was staged. The summary by Hyginus of the play mentions an aetiology of Aigai, which had a theatre, and might have been a possible performance place.[45] We cannot therefore discuss how Euripides' tragedy was immediately received in Macedon or how it might have been circulated within or beyond its walls. What we can see, however, is its lasting impact on the wider Greek international stage, as I intimated above. It has been observed that Euripides' plays 'were absorbed to an extraordinary depth' in Macedon as a result of the poet's time there,[46] to the point that several decades later, Alexander and his courtiers displayed an easy familiarity with Euripidean texts, quoting liberally from them, according to various anecdotes.[47] As in Sicily, we have reports of other famous figures who also traveled to Archelaus' court, such as the poet Timotheus (Socrates was allegedly invited as well).[48] Their impact was not, however, as long-lasting nor wide-ranging as that of Euripides.

In *Republic* 568ab Plato discusses this compelling connection between tragic poets and tyrants, specifically naming tragedians as 'men who sing the praises of tyranny' (*tyrannidos hymnētas*).[49] The fourth-century thinker may have indeed been thinking of Aeschylus and Euripides. As we have seen in this section, the two can be cited as tragic poets who use their art both to enhance and to promote the public image of an autocrat. Both *Women of Aetna* and *Archelaus* seemingly featured new or adapted mythical narratives which were ultimately meant to help bolster the rule of the same autocratic patrons who sponsored

the poets. If we additionally consider the origins of tragedy, which, despite their murkiness, point to a genre that arose in the time of the Peisistratid tyrants in sixth century BC Athens, then perhaps Plato's proposition of tragedians as apologists for tyranny might not seem so surprising. In this way autocracies can be seen as a natural venue for tragic performance. Under the direct sponsorship of the rulers which it helped legitimize, tragedy was therefore able to circulate in a wider and more international context beyond Athens, reaching peripheral venues such as Sicily and Macedon, both of which are located in the outskirts of the larger Greek-speaking world.

b. Greek Tragedy in the Footsteps of Alexander

From the fourth century onwards, tragedy's appeal continued unabated.[50] Though tragedy continued to be produced in Athens in the fourth century, it began to be disseminated well beyond its point of origin.[51] In the fifth century, Athenian tragedy traveled as far west as Sicily, and as far north as Macedon, as we saw in the previous section. The Macedonian connection in particular appears to have been fundamental in helping tragedy flourish beyond its Athenian and especially religious roots; scholars cite the unique role that Macedonian patrons had in shaping the future development and direction of tragedy.[52] I showed above the manner in which Archaelaus attracted Euripides and other Greek poets to his court, and how the evidence points to the ruler's commissioning of a new tragic piece that would help both establish and propagate a Hellenic lineage for him.[53] For Archelaus' most famous fourth-century successors, Philip and his son Alexander, the evidence for their use and promotion of tragedy is stronger and better defined. Philip, for example, established a theatre at the Macedonian capital of Aigai, and his death reportedly took place in this same theatre,

strikingly prior to hearing a tragic ode.[54] Both organized dramatic competitions at significant junctures, such as the destruction of Olynthus in 348 BC.[55] But of the two, it was Alexander who appears to have been most fascinated with theatre, quoting fluently tragic excerpts by Euripides, or even arranging for a dramatic contest to take place immediately prior to his departure for Asia.[56] Athenaeus reports that he had so many actors as part of his greater entourage that they began to be referred to as 'Alexander-flatterers' (*Alexandrokolakes*) instead of 'Dionysus-flatterers' (*Dionusokolakes*).[57] Various accounts discuss his repeated sponsorship of dramatic performances while on campaign, which critically helped disseminate tragedy across a variety of new venues, from across the Balkans to various points in Asia such as Ai Khanoum, in modern day Afghanistan.[58] In this section, I briefly discuss the larger significance of Alexander's promotion of tragedy during his travels across Asia. With Alexander, tragedy not only continues to flourish under the direct sponsorship of an autocrat but it also becomes a ready-made symbol of Hellenic culture which can easily be transported and transplanted anywhere. What is especially noteworthy is the manner in which Alexander singlehandedly helps circulate tragedy by creating new public festivals and celebrations in which it can be performed and consumed by a wide and varied audience.

Vesa Vahtikari identifies a tripartite pattern from the extant sources which summarize Alexander's engagement with theatre during his various campaigns: '1) Alexander is coming back from somewhere, 2) he rests with his troops, and 3) he holds a festival / a dramatic contest / a drinking party / a Dionysiac revel.'[59] While in many instances accounts can be vague, merely reporting that he held 'athletic and musical contests', it is clear that many of these contests specifically involved dramatic performances.[60] Arrian, for example, reports that in 324 upon reaching Ecbatana (in modern day Iran), Alexander hosted such athletic and musical contests,[61] but Plutarch's account clarifies that in this same event Alexander was

involved 'in theatres and festivals' (*en theatrois kai panēgyresin*).[62] At his own wedding to the Persian King's daughter also in 324, he reportedly hosted five days of dramatic and musical competitions in Susa in order to celebrate his nuptials to the Persian King's daughter.[63] From these accounts it seems that Alexander helped spread tragedy by linking it specifically to large public festive gatherings. These occasions were generally aimed at celebrating a recent feat, such as arriving in a new location, or the success of a military campaign. The accounts unanimously claim that it was Alexander himself who issued the order for these occasions to be held. In this manner, under Alexander, dramatic performances, and tragedy by extension, become events that are explicitly decreed by the king, and no longer take place in a civic context or even as a result of a particular poet's visit, as we had seen previously in the discussion of Aeschylus' and Euripides' respective visits to Sicily and Macedon. In Plutarch's account of Alexander's arrival at Ecbatana, mentioned above, the biographer mentions that three thousand artists arrived from Greece for that particular event, which suggests that an invitation by the king himself was responsible for their presence.[64] These festivals and celebrations were thus a visible sign and display of his power. Scholars have discussed the manner in which the king transforms himself into a champion of Greek culture, promoting in particular two venues long connected with the city of Athens, the theatre and the gymnasium.[65] His promotion of both would have had a huge impact on his army and soldiers and their conception of leisure, as the main beneficiaries of such entertainment.[66] Moreover, the prominence given to dramatic performances in these general celebratory and commemorative festivals would have helped encourage local populations who may have never encountered tragedy to embrace this new genre. In this manner, Alexander becomes one of the most important promoters of the genre, a one-man site of circulation.

Scholars such as Brigitte Le Guen have discussed the problematic nature of the sources which relate Alexander's theatrical activities and his enthusiasm for tragedy.[67] Plutarch in particular emerges as an especially challenging source. Judith Mossman has, for example, examined the tragic elements present in Plutarch's *Alexander*, particularly the theme of Dionysiac tragic self-destruction.[68] Her discussion reveals Plutarch's technique of 'tragic patterning', that is, the manner in which the writer uses tragedy to create 'a more rounded or shaded characterization' for his hero.[69] While acknowledging such 'tragic coloring' as part of a biographer's rhetorical stragegy, Martin Revermann nevertheless argues that these stories about Alexander and his enthusiasm for theater must 'originate in an authentic and widely-known familiarity of the king with drama'.[70] These stories may also have another historical basis, as scholars have recognized the lengths to which the king went to associate himself with the god Dionysus, particularly after his arrival on Indian soil.[71] This historical self-association with the god is a crucial part of both Alexander's legacy and the further dissemination of tragedy: later Hellenistic monarchs decided to follow in his footsteps, specifically appropriating the image of Dionysus as an official part of royal ideology and promoting theatre in order to emphasize this new connection.[72] In either case, it is easy to see the weight and authority that tragedy carries, both as a means of further solidifying a ruler's connection with Dionysus but also as an effective literary strategy for an ancient biographer.

Across the Hellenistic period, Alexander's successors continued this intimate connection with theatre, sponsoring many festivals featuring drama, in many cases naming them after themselves, or simply attaching their name to an existing festival.[73] In this context of carefully curated festivals produced by monarchs, it is clear that tragedy is a both an established and effective tool of royal propaganda.[74] As Jane Lightfoot states, these rulers

manage to employ such festivals, and tragedy by extension, 'both nakedly and on a more subtle level', visibly insinuating their presence into the life of the community by specifically altering the civic calendar and city life.[75] It is in this context of autocratic self-promotion that the Associations of Artists (*technitai*) of Dionysus were able to flourish, that is, professional associations consisting of musicians, poets, and performers were likewise crucial in spreading theatre.[76] As independent city-states yielded to larger autocratic spheres of influence, these artists flocked to the various festivals sponsored by Hellenistic rulers across the Mediterranean, and their overall participation in such events was crucial in promoting the new ruler-cults that emerged around each individual monarch, and thus generally in affirming royal power.[77]

In addition to facilitating spectacular productions that legitimized monarchs, these festivals additionally function as important sites in which Hellenic values can be both performed and articulated. Alexander's campaigns significantly expanded the Greek-speaking world, and as a result such festivals and celebrations played a key role in helping new cities celebrate and advertise their Greekness. In this context, tragedy can additionally be seen as a transportable and accessible declaration of Greek identity. By establishing tragedy as a main event for general celebratory festivals, Alexander thus set up the general framework within which tragedy continued to circulate across various centuries and in diverse geographical venues.

c. Tragedy in Hellenistic Democracies

With Alexander the Great, theatrical activity continued to expand throughout the Mediterranean and especially across the newly enlarged Hellenistic world.[78] We have not

only accounts of various festivals featuring dramatic performances (several islands, for example, held a Dionysia, including Chios, Lemnos, and Paros),[79] but also reports of various people involved with theatre, such as the many associations of Artists of Dionysus, which were briefly discussed above.[80] The evidence for theatrical activity similarly increases, ranging beyond the literary to include a wider range of epigraphic and archaeologic material. Although the scant and fragmentary nature of the evidence does not allow us to make a systematic or authoritative summary of the various sites of performance and circulation that existed in this period, the sheer fact that it was widespread shows that drama continued to play an important role in a variety of contexts across the Hellenistic world. As we saw in the previous section, dramatic performances were often a vital part of the larger celebratory culture for a particular Hellenistic ruler, and were an important means by which the ruler displayed his power and general largesse to the wider public. However, not all Hellenistic venues for the performance of tragedy were automatically autocratic. In this section I touch on two non-autocratic contexts which appear to have embraced the older Athenian version of tragedy in the Hellenistic period: Cos and Rhodes, two islands which were technically autonomous and 'democratic' in a time of monarchs, had a system of *chorēgia* in place for various religious festivals featuring dramatic contests.[81] In the late fourth century, the city of Athens reformed the institution of *chorēgia*, replacing it with *agnothesia*, i.e. a single elected official (*agnothetēs*) responsible for overseeing contests and in particular organizing choruses on behalf of the city.[82] In this context, it is impressive to see the choregic system that was formerly a hallmark of Athenian drama flourishing so far away from Attica. My discussion illuminates the fact that the larger civic and liturgical frameworks in which tragedy was initially performed were also themselves important sites which facilitated both the performance and circulation of drama, even when it was removed from Athens.

From the late fourth century onwards, there were at least two festivals for Dionysus in Cos, one of the Dodecanese islands on the southeast Aegean.[83] These festivals appear to have featured substantial choregic activity, as evidenced by various victor lists naming the winning *chorēgoi* in both dramatic and choral contests held there.[84] One of the inscriptions (*ED* 234) makes clear that the contests were numerous and extensive: it lists processions by boys (*pompas paidōn*, l. 2), *chorēgoi* for cyclic *pyrrhikha* (10-11, and 22-3), comic actors (15), and *chorēgoi* for tragedy (34-5).[85] The lists of victors also include professional actors who were not Rhodian, which suggests that this was an international festival that attracted luminaries from abroad.[86] From 242 BC onward there also appears to have been another major international festival on the island, the Great Asclepieia, which similarly featured dramatic and musical competitions.[87] There are various decrees and inscriptions which additionally testify to the presence of a guild of non-local Dionysiac artists who visited the festival.[88] Inscriptional evidence on Rhodes similarly make clear that from the third to first centuries BC the island played host to a variety of festivals, including an Alexandreia festival in honor of Alexander, which likewise featured a choregic system facilitating dramatic performances.[89] Multiple literary sources indicate that Rhodes had several theatres,[90] which is not surprising given the island's cultural importance as a site for the performance of Greek poetry.[91] In both cases, it appears that the choregic system functioned much as it had in Athens, allowing for wealthy and aristocratic citizens to take up a large portion of the expense in producing these dramatic and musical contests. Given this similarity, it is assumed that they were modeled on the Athenian system.

These festivals seemed, however, to have attracted benefactors beyond the local aristocrats who participated in the system of *chorēgia*.[92] Vincent Gabrielsen notes that after the earthquake of 227 BC, the Rhodians received a donation of 60,000 drachmas from the

Syracusan ruler Hieron and his son Gelon, money which was earmarked for the 'enrichment (*epauxēsis*) of the citizens'; for the same occasion Ptolemy III Euergetes donated an impressive amount of Egyptian grain to Rhodes, a donation that was specifically to be used for entertainment.[93] While these festivals appear to have been organized locally, they nevertheless attracted powerful international patrons who may have had some say in their administration. This also applies to the islands themselves: despite their independent nature as islands free to govern themselves, they nevertheless seem to have been under the spheres of influence of particular monarchs. In fact, both islands had arrangements with Antigonous and the later Ptolemies.[94] Though built around a choregic framework that clearly evoked classical Athens, the festivals themselves took place in a complex world in which 'democratic' islands had to grapple with powerful monarchs.

Other cities well beyond Athens appear to have had a system of *chorēgia* as early as the fifth century BC. One such case is the city of Mytilene in Lesbos. Antiphon's *On the Murder of Herodes* includes testimony from a certain Mytilenean named Euxitheus, who, when providing a defense of his father in connection with the revolt of Mytilene from Athens in 428 BC, mentions furnishing choruses in local festivals at Mytilene in a context of public service (*lēitourgia*).[95] This evidence, though it does not pertain specifically to theatre, suggests that a choregic system similar to that of Athens may have been in place as early as the fifth century; in other words this might be evidence that the city of Mytilene had a framework in place which was amenable to the circulation and production of drama. There are various epigraphic records which mention that Dionysia continued to occur in Lesbos at the end of the third century BC.[96] Despite the patchiness of the evidence, the continued presence of theatrical activity in the third century might be reasonably ascribed to the choregic system which had been in place from the fifth century. This additionally illuminates

the discussion of Cos and Rhodes, as it further testifies to the importance of *chorēgia* as an important framework for the circulation of tragedy. If we moreover consider these islands' strategic position in the Mediterranean, with direct connections to Egypt, Asia Minor, and other eastern points, we can see the importance of such festivals in further promoting tragedy. Rhodes' early alliance with Rome in 164 BC moreover makes it a suggestive space for the spread of tragedy to a Roman market; after all we know that important figures such as Cicero visited Rhodes as part of their education.[97] In any case, it is clear that tragedy was firmly established in a variety of venues across the Hellenistic world, and as such well positioned for further spread as the Greek world expanded and especially as Greeks came into contact with other cultures.

II. Rome

In the section above, I sketched some of the ways in which Athenian tragedy spread throughout the Greek world, focusing on particular key moments in the classical and Hellenistic periods, from Aeschylus' and Euripides' visits to the courts of autocrats in the periphery of the Greek world to the festivals of the democratic islands of Rhodes and Cos in the Hellenistic period, via the campaigns of Alexander the Great across Asia. In the Roman period, we continue to see the further proliferation and even transformation of tragedy in a variety of venues and contexts, not only physical but also imaginative. Given the wide-ranging nature of this impact and dissemination, this section considers 'sites of performance and circulation' in a broader sense: rather than outlining the genre's importance in various geographical locations across the Mediterranean as in the previous section, I now discuss

'site' as a textual and imaginative entity. This shift is necessary for understanding tragedy's movements across the Roman and later worlds, particularly since tragedy for the Romans was often understood and experienced as a literary phenomenon, divorced from a particular performative context. In a context in which tragedy is both mediated and experienced primarily through a variety of texts, an account of these sites of circulation and performance must therefore consider multiple receptions, primary, secondary, and beyond.

a. A Note on Roman Tragedy

Though my focus on the remainder of this chapter is on the circulation of *Greek* tragedy in Rome, a brief note on Roman tragedy is warranted, given that Roman readers would have had access to both Greek and Roman tragic texts. Roman tragedy originates in the direct transposition of a Greek play into Latin:[98] Livius Andronicus' production which was adapted from a Greek model at the *Ludi Romani* of 240 BC in honor of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.[99] Though there existed various local and independent performance traditions before this specific event,[100] Greek-style drama heavily influenced the definition and composition of Roman theatre.[101] There were other Roman dramatic genres, such as the *fabula praextexta* and *fabula togata*, but the scant nature of the surviving evidence of these genres suggests that they were far fewer than the tragedies and comedies stemming from a Greek original.[102] One therefore must acknowledge one of the critical issues at the heart of what we have come to know as 'Roman' drama, namely, its nature as a subgenre that is modeled after its Greek forebear, and consider how this complicates both the understanding and circulation of tragedy in Rome.

The early figures responsible for the creation of Roman theatre – Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius – are widely recognized as men who possessed sufficient familiarity with Greek dramatic traditions, with access to the various theatrical performances and representations of Greek drama in South Italy that emerged from the fourth century BC onward.[103] That their 'translations' led to the establishment of a new Roman genre illustrates not only the general popularity and appeal that Greek drama had beyond Greek shores, but also the importance of translation and adaptation as a key route of circulation. However, when compared to comedy, a genre which also borrowed from its Greek model, Republican adaptations or 'translations' of Greek tragedy in Rome appear not to have been as successful as its popular comic counterpart precisely because of the same 'derivative' nature. We have no single Roman Republican tragic play that has survived complete, and besides some meager fragments, instead we possess a series of value judgements on the worthlessness of Roman tragedy.[104] Part of the reason for this low estimation was the elevated place that Greek texts held in Roman education. The formal teaching of rhetoric included analysis of poetic texts, often in both Greek and Latin, and a public career in oratory involved memorization and recitation of tragic excerpts seen to contain examples of persuasive argumentation.[105] In this manner Greek tragedy was circulated along with Roman tragic texts for an educated and elite audience. Given this model of parallel circulation, Roman tragedy was likely not appreciated on its own terms, always existing under the shadow of its Greek counterpart. In Roman Republican tragedy, the Greek imprint is so powerful that it even helps construct a history of the genre: Cicero, for example, proposes the tragic triad of Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius to match their Athenian predecessors Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (*De Or.* 3.27).

Though there is evidence for the popularity of tragedy in Republican Rome as a performed event, it increasingly becomes a subject of textual study, and as such experienced privately and internally.[106] In Republican Rome, the period between April and November was filled with various *ludi*, religious festivals which incorporated dramatic performances, and *ludi scaenici* were part of major festivals.[107] However, despite this tradition of performance, beginning in the early Augustan period tragedy does not always have a full scale stage performance.[108] Instead, reading plays became the main method of experiencing tragedy.[109] Evidence for this shift is already evident in Cicero's time, and in fact further testifies to the parallel circulation of Greek and Roman texts. In an opening discussion justifying the rendering of Greek philosophy into Latin, (*Fin.* 1.2.4), Cicero cites the general practice of Latin plays that are effectively translated from the Greek almost verbatim:

> Why should they dislike their native language for serious and important subjects, when they are quite willing to read Latin plays translated word for word from the Greek? Who has such a hatred, one might almost say for the very name of Roman, as to despise and reject the *Medea* of Ennius or the *Antiope* of Pacuvius, and give as his reason that though he enjoys the corresponding plays of Euripides he cannot endure books written in Latin? What, he cries, am I to read *The Young Comrades* of Caecilius, or Terence's *Maid of Andros*, when I might be reading the same two comedies of Menander? With this sort of person I disagree so strongly, that, admitting the *Electra* of Sophocles to be a masterpiece, I yet think Atilius's poor translation of it worth my while to read.[110]

This passage makes clear that readers such as Cicero had easy access to both the Greek and Roman versions of various dramatic texts. It also encapsulates the ambiguities of these 'new'

Roman texts: should they be seen as verbatim translations or autonomous texts in their own right? The passage additionally reveals the impact that such a model of parallel circulation often has on Roman texts, often contributing to a poor understanding and devaluation of what is effectively seen as a Roman copy in favor of the Greek original. As the passage continues, Cicero insists that Roman versions go beyond mere translation, and that Roman writers like himself 'add to them our own opinions and style of composition' (*nostrum iudicium et nostrum scribendi ordinem adiungimus*).[111] The larger issue of the Roman imitation, adaptation and/or emulation of Greek texts is complex and fraught, but in the particular case of Roman tragedy it has contributed to the dominance of comparison as the primary means of assessing the subgenre, to its ultimate detriment.

A further complication lies in the fact that tragedy in the first century AD, tragedy appears to undergo a major transformation from a performed event to a largely internalized experience. This certainly appears to be the case for the only examples of Roman tragedy which survive complete: the tragedies of Seneca. The question of whether they were performed or even intended for performance is difficult to ascertain, but scholars tend towards a negative response to the matter of actual performance, often pointing to the fact that the texts themselves contain no indications of stagecraft and performance history.[112] However, these same scholars nevertheless recognize the theatricality and theatrical power of Seneca's plays.[113] One of the most powerful scenes in extant Senecan tragedy relates at length the manner in which Atreus, acting as a priest, presides over a ritual cooking of the sons of Thyestes. This long and gruesome scene found at *Thyestes* 623-788 is actually part of a larger messenger speech, in which Atreus' slaughter of his brother's children is related to the chorus. Annette Baertschi reminds us that Seneca routinely included such graphic messenger scenes at the very heart of his tragedies, discussing in particular the messenger as

a spectator of action that is inaccessible to the audience, who can 'recreate for the audience an otherwise irretrievable scene'.[114] Messenger scenes were a key feature of Greek tragedy, which itself notoriously relegated all violent action to the unseen offstage space. In giving it such a central place, Seneca is foregrounding a key element of tragedy. If we consider that such a scene is meant to be experienced privately in the theater of the mind, his emphasis on violent and spectacular action that is reported becomes even more striking. The transformation of drama from a performed and public event to an internal and private experience compounds the complexity of the changing nature of tragic performance contexts in the Roman world. Secondary and imaginary receptions of tragedy cannot be ignored as with the rise of reading they themselves become critical contexts for circulation, and a different kind of site of performance.

b. Quotations of Tragedy in Philosophical Texts

As intimated above, one of the most important 'sites of circulation' in Rome was education, Evidence for tragedy's crucial role in Roman Republican cultural education can be seen throughout the writings of Cicero.[115] His letters in particular include direct quotations from extant Greek tragedy, and as such are an important source and site of circulation.[116] For example, in a letter to Atticus dated January 49 BC (*Att*. 7.11.1), Cicero applies a verse from Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (506) in which Eteocles praises tyranny to the recent actions of Caesar.[117] According to Ingo Gildenhard, by means of this single quotation Cicero effectively transforms Caesar 'into a Greek tragic monster lusting for absolute power'.[118] For this transformation to be effective, however, the reader of the letter must be able to recognize the context of the quotation; in other words, both the author of the letter and its recipient must

possess a reasonable familiarity with the original source text. As Sander Goldberg explains, since Cicero's tastes in quotation generally correspond to 'school texts and cultural landmarks', the educational common ground between Cicero and his readers is always emphasized.[119]

Cicero is in many ways an extraordinary case: he is not only extremely well-educated, but also appears to have been especially knowledgeable about Greek and Latin drama; as we saw above, he is an important source on the general issue of Roman plays that are translated into Latin from the Greek.[120] It is useful to note that whereas Cicero discusses Roman dramatic texts and their Greek forebears, he does not mention attending any actual theatrical performances. In other words, it appears that these quotations are drawn from his own reading of these texts rather than any experience of performance.[121]

Cicero's philosophic dialogues illustrate the manner in which a single individual reader can nonetheless act as a site of circulation. Cicero 'circulates' tragedy via various quotations and references in his philosophic dialogues, especially *The Tusculan Disputations*, which contain the largest number of quotations from Greek and Roman poetry than in any other dialogue by Cicero.[122] In this extended philosophic prose text addressed to Brutus, Cicero imports various tragic references in discussions about emotions such as pain, grief, and death. In particular, the second book, which is devoted to pain and how to endure it, includes explicit references and quotations to tragedy, both Greek and Roman, with a special emphasis on the former. Given the focus on pain, the tragic figures of Philoctetes, Heracles and Prometheus feature prominently in Cicero's account of the various views of pain that forms the focus of the narrative section (15-31a) of the dialogue. In order to draw attention to their suffering, Cicero quotes the sounds of pain which they emit in tragedy. Cicero first

quotes six verses in Latin uttered by a groaning Philoctetes in the play that is ostensibly the *Philoctetes* of Accius (2.19).[123] He then moves to a fuller consideration of the portrayal of pain in two Greek tragic texts related to Heracles and Prometheus, quoting these two texts far more extensively than the six verses from Accius: in 2.20-22, he loosely translates forty-five verses from Heracles' first speech in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (1046-1103) — *i.e.* the majority of this speech — followed by twenty-eight lines uttered by Prometheus in 2.23-25 from the lost play *Prometheus Luomenos* (*Prometheus Unbound*), presumably by Aeschylus.[124] This is a rare instance in which we find the translation of a passage whose original verses are completely lost.[125]

Why does he quote so extensively from these Greek source texts and provide his own Latin translation? The inordinate focus on Heracles can be explained given his importance for the representation of pain in Latin poetry: later, Ovid would similarly draw from the *Trachiniae* for the scene in his *Metamorphoses* featuring the suffering of Heracles (*Met.* 9.159-229) as would Seneca in his *Hercules Oetaeus*.[126] In all these cases, however, quotations from drama are directly employed to support philosophical arguments.[127] Here, drama arguably does more than simply provide clear examples of suffering and emotion. The direct parroting of its language transforms both the prose text and the philosophical argument contained in it. Tragic theatre therefore becomes a sort of universal language which can easily be called upon to testify to any account of suffering. As such, it can be re-performed in pithy excerpts, which themselves instantly possess the power to lend credence to any narrative and argument.

c. Novel Receptions

By the time the novel emerges as a new genre in the Roman imperial world, the authority and influence that tragedy wielded was immense, to the point that it would be impossible to trace its many receptions, which easily go beyond secondary, in their entirety. While its performance in the Roman imperial period is notoriously difficult and ambiguous to determine, it is clear that it was a prominent feature in the cultural life of the period.[128] Numerous tragic imprints and strands appear in a variety of literary texts, including in the emerging genre of prose fiction. Tragedy is indeed one of the many genres featured in the ancient novel, which famously collapses and synthesizes a variety of genres,[129] producing a unique hybrid text which Mikhail Bakthin called polyglossic or heteroglossic.[130] As my brief sketch of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* illustrates, the presence and integration of general tragic imagery, themes, and allusions in the ancient novel not only demonstrates the widespread nature of tragedy's dissemination at the period but also its overall unwieldiness and effusive nature as a genre that is uber-present.

Regine May has recently shown Apuleius' wide and rich interest in drama, from tragedy and comedy to pantomime, and the manner in which the second-century AD writer integrates all three genres into his novel.[131] Comedy is particularly prevalent throughout the *Metamorphoses*, which contains a variety of comic motifs and frameworks.[132] Though more difficult to trace, given that it is modeled to some extent after a lost Greek original,[133] tragedy nevertheless made a noticeable impact on this work, particularly as a general theme in its inserted tales.[134] Though tragedy features in other parts of the novel,[135] it is given special attention in book 10, when the narrator introduces a new tale that is marked as especially tragic:

> So now, excellent reader, know that you are reading a tragedy, and no light tale, and that you are rising from the lowly slipper to the lofty buskin (*Met*. 10.2)[136]

This shift in tone is followed by general sketch of a story involving a stepmother in love with her chaste stepson, which immediately brings to mind the story of Phaedra. Though there are various other sources for this famous mythic story, including Latin literary texts such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Labrius' Belonistria mime,[137] the mention of the buskin (*coturnus*) immediately signals that the main intertext that must be understood here is tragedy. The Phaedra story had various tragic formulations, however, both Greek and Roman: the two famous *Hippolytoi* of Euripides (*Kalyptomenos* and *Stephanephoros*), Sophocles' *and* Seneca's *Phaedra*.[138] Given the multiplicity of tragic sources that deal with the same tragic material, it is impossible to tell whether Apuleius was privileging a particular mythical formulation of Phaedra, or the entire tragic tradition. The parallel circulation of these versions as well as their multiple invocations in a plethora of other genres compounds the difficulties, as a knowledge of these texts can be gleaned from other invocations. Can we therefore automatically assume that Apuleius had some personal experience with these tragedies when re-performing their general plot in his novel? There is additionally an unexpected reversal at the end of this particular tale, subverting the expectations of the reader who, primed to expect a tragedy, now finds herself faced with a comedy.[139] The co-existence of tragic with comic elements testifies to the rich literary texture of the novel and the manner in which it can blend a variety of genres producing a unique mix.

If we turn to the Greek novel, we can similarly detect the pervasive and important role of tragic references. In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* tragedy also features in the inserted tales of

minor characters as well as in subplots.[140] The tragic specter of Hippolytus is invoked in both Cnemon's story about this stepmother (Hippolytus is actually named at 1.10.2) and in the scene where Theagenes is pursued by Arsace and her nurse Cybele.[141] The novel teems with figures who seem to have walked out of the world of tragedy: Thyamis and Petosiris can easily be seen as versions of the warring brothers Eteocles and Polynices, a comparison which immediately transforms Calasiris into Oedipus.[142] In an article illustrating the manner in which Heliodorus invokes the *Iphigenia* plays of Euripides, Anna Leftratou writes that the role of tragedy in the novel is beyond intertextual: in her view, it is 'hypertextual', as 'the Heliodoran transposition of Euripides' dramas is realized through both plot and genre'.[143] This notion of tragedy's hypertextuality powerfully encapsulates the new and powerful ways in which literary texts at the close of antiquity had become sites for the performance of tragedy in their own right. Tragedy had become a genre so internalized and embedded in the larger culture that it can be experienced and re-performed in parts, since mere fragments or whispers of it can readily assemble an entire tragic structure.

---

[1] The bibliography on this topic is extensive, but see, e.g., Pickard-Cambridge 1988, Csapo and Slater 1995, Cartledge 1997, Easterling 1997b.

[2] Winkler and Zeitlin 1990; cf. Vernant 1988, which paved the way for much of this thinking.

[3] Tragedy, according to Cartledge (1997: 3), was 'itself an active ingredient, and a major one, of the political foreground, featuring in the everyday consciousness and even the nocturnal dreams of the Athenian citizen'. See also Goldhill 1997.

[4] Wilson 2000.

[5] Sicily: Bosher 2012a; Black Sea: Braund and Hall 2014. Stewart 2017, however, argues that the 'Panhellenic' nature of tragedy is evident from its inception.

[6] For some partial answers, see Csapo 2004, Taplin 1999, Taplin 2007, Taplin 2012, Csapo et al. 2014, Csapo and Wilson 2015, and Stewart 2017. Green (2008: 97-98) contains a partial overview of recent scholarship.

[7] For a more comprehensive account of the re-performances of tragedy in monarchies outside of Athens, see Duncan 2015.

[8] On the lives of poets as a source and genre, see Lefkowitz 1981 and Fletcher and Hanink 2016.

[9] See also the scholiast to Ar. *Pax* 73b who describes Aeschylus in similar terms.

[10] As Csapo (2010: 96) elaborates, these fourteen sources 'include some of our most trusted authorities: men like Eratosthenes and Plutarch. To reject such information offhand because of methodical or generic doubt is unreasonable'. Scholars agree that Aeschylus most likely visited Sicily at least twice: see *TrGF*[3] T 88-92 and Morgan 2015: 96 n. 31.

[11] Dougherty 1991.

[12] Diod. Sic. 11.49**.** See Luraghi 1994: 335-46 and Smith 2012: 130-2.

[13] The Theban poet Pindar likewise celebrates the founding of the city in his first *Pythian*, but epinician poetry is by nature commissioned work, unlike tragedy, which at this time was almost exclusively produced within the framework of the polis; see Morrison 2007 and Morgan 2015.

[14] Poli-Palladini 2001: 296.

[15] Ibid., 319-23. Dougherty 1991 speaks of the 'colonization' of the Palici, the autochthonous Sicel gods, into Greek mythology.

[16] See Poli-Palladini 2001: 289-96 for an overview.

[17] As Taplin (1977: 416) comments, 'the single change of scene in *Eum[enides]* is extraordinary enough: changes on the scale indicated in *Aitnaiai* were unknown before the publication of this fragment.'

[18] Ibid., 417.

[19] Poli-Palladini 2001: 318. Recent research into theatres in Sicily suggests that fifth-century theatres there were advanced; for example, the theatre at Syracuse which was rebuilt around 460 BC included a low stage and three doors, which enabled sophisticated drama to be performed. For an overview of Sicilian theatrical culture in the classical period, see Csapo and Wilson 2015: 328-44.

[20] Morgan 2015: 96. Cf. Bosher 2012b who suggests the play's *first* performance happened in Sicily.

[21] The scholiast's comments on Ar. *Ran*. 1028-9 have been used to support the notion of that *Persians* was re-performed in Sicily; see Broggiato 2014. On the re-performance and revivals of old tragedies generally, see Easterling 1993, Easterling 1994, Taplin 1999, Hanink 2014a, Nervegna 2014, and Lamari 2015.

[22] Taplin 2006: 3.

[23] Ibid., 4.

[24] Rehm 1989: 31. See also Scodel 2001.

[25] *TrGF*[3] T3. His tomb at Gela allegedly became a pilgrimage site, see *Life of Aeschylus* 11, *TrGF*[3] T1.40-47. On the likelihood that Aeschylus was given the honor of a hero cult, see Wilson 2007: 357, Poli Palladini 2013: 284-316 and Nervegna 2014: 172.

[26] Griffith 1978: 106, cf. Herrington 1967.

[27] *TrGF*[1] 3 T6, Harvey 2000: 114-5, Morgan 2012: 49, Nervegna 2014: 172, n. 97.

[28] Schol. on Arist. *Rh*. 1417b.18.

[29] As Dearden (1990: 232) writes, 'in the opinion of ancient authorities, the poets who worked there in the 4th century BC were pale imitations of Aeschylus and Euripides.'

[30] Hanink 2010: 46.

[31] Taplin 1993 and 2007.

[32] *Life of Euripides* 21-25.

[33] The evidence found in the *Life of Euripides* can be supplemented by accounts found in Schol. Ar. *Ran*. 83 as well as Pl. *Symp*. 172c.

[34] Hammond and Griffith (1979): 162 and 391 and Revermann 1999-2000: 454-5.

[35] Though my discussion centers here on the *Archealus*, some scholars have also considered whether other Euripidean plays may have also been composed or performed at Archelaus' court, specifically *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia at Aulis* given their late composition and also *Andromache*, which contains some references to Macedonia (a scholion on line 445 moreover suggests it was not produced in Athens). See Revermann 1999-2000: 461-2 and Allan 2000: 149-60.

[36] Moloney 2014: 235 and 240-48.

[37] Demosthenes (10.31-4) would later call Archelaus' later successor, Philip, a barbarian. See also Badian 1982 and the first six essays in Wallace and Harris 1996.

[38] Moloney 2014: 238.

[39] As Moloney (ibid.) states, in this manner Euripides endorses 'the claims of the royal line that they are Temenidai in exile from Argos.'

[40] Harder 1985: 130.

[41] Revermann 1999-2000: 454 discusses this as a deliberate strategy by the Macedonians, typically considered barbarians, which aimed 'to dispel the stigma of cultural inferiority'.

[42] *TRGF*[5.1] T1.20.

[43] See, e.g., Isoc. *Orat*. 5.95-105, 120-3, 132-6.

[44] Bosworth 1996b: 140-1.

[45] Wiles 1997: 38-9.

[46] Bosworth 1996b: 142.

[47] Ibid., 142-6.

[48] Moloney 2014: 234. Agathon also visited Macedon, cf. Sch. to Ar. *Ran.* 93 and also Ael. *VH* 13.4 which includes story of Agathon and Euripides kissing at the court of Archelaus.

[49] For this reason, according to Plato, they are to be excluded from the city. Cf. Adam 1969: II, 260.

[50] Csapo 2010: 95-103 and Nervegna 2014.

[51] On tragedy in fourth-century Athens, see Hanink 2014b. On its dissemination outside Attica, see Csapo 2010 and Stewart 2017.

[52] Moloney 2014: 233. See also Wilson 2000: 287-89. Revermann 1999-2000, Csapo 2010, and Le Guen 2014.

[53] Archelaus also established theatrical contests in the festival of the Olympia at Dion: see Diod. Sic. 17. 16; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 2; Wilson 2000: 287, and Stewart 2017: 130-1.

[54] On the establishment of the theatre, see Wiles 1997: 38-9. On the tragic overtones of his death, see Duncan 2015: 310-11.

[55] Le Guen 2014: 249.

[56] Ath. 12 537d, Le Guen 2014: 249 and 270. Cf. Le Guen 1995: 60-1 who notes that stone theatres multiply in the aftermath of the new space created by the conquest of Alexander.

[57] Ath. 12.539, cf. Duncan 2015: 311

[58] Revermann 1999-2000: 456-61 and Le Guen 2014.

[59] Vahtikari 2014: 111.

[60] E.g. Arr. *Anab.* 3, 1, 4 and 6, 3, 1-2. See extended tables in Le Guen 2014: 251-5.

[61] Arr. *Anab.* 7, 14, 1.

[62] Plut. *Vit. Alex*. 72.

[63] Ath. 13, 538b-539a; see also Duncan 2015: 311-3.

[64] Plut. *Vit*. *Alex* 72.

[65] As Le Guen (2014: 269) states, 'in laying claim to an area of supremacy long held by the city of Athens Alexander went far beyond the politics initiated by Archelaus'.

[66] Le Guen (ibid.) notes that these competitions 'all shared the common aim of providing the soldiers, whether they participated or merely spectated, with relaxation and leisure and the chance to forget for a time the hard realities of combat.'

[67] Ibid., 250.

[68] Mossman 1988.

[69] Mossman 2014: 438. See also Pelling 1999: 365 who points out the theatrical motifs in the story.

[70] Revermann 1999-2000: 455

[71] Bosworth 1996a and Le Guen 2014: 271.

[72] Le Guen 2014: 271.

[73] Lightfoot 2002: 221. See also Buraselis 2012.

[74] Kotlińska-Toma 2015: 245-6.

[75] Lightfoot 2002: 221

[76] Le Guen 2001a and Lightfoot 2002. For *technitai* in Athens, see Hanink 2014a: 231-4.

[77] Lightfoot 2002: 220-1.

[78] Le Guen 1995. Le Guen 2001b gives several tables outlining the theatres, contests on the Greek islands.

[79] Le Guen 2001b: 267-76. See also Le Guen 1995 and Ceccarelli 2010.

[80] See Le Guen 2001a for an impressive account of these artists. It is important to note that dramatic representations also occurred under the auspices of other gods beyond Dionysus; see Le Guen 1995: 65.

[81] For an overview of *chorēgia* outside Attica, see Wilson 2000 279-302.

[82] Wilson 2000 307-8; Kotlińska-Toma 2015: 243-6; Hanink 2014a: 225-231

[83] Sherwin-White 1978: 315 and Csapo and Wilson 2015: 353.

[84] Wilson 2000: 289-90 and Le Guen 2001b: 274.

[85] Segre 1993: 154-6 (*ED* 234); see also Ceccarelli 1995: 287-8.

[86] E.g. *ED* 52, ll. 11-13 in Segre 1993: 46; *ED* 234 ll. 15-17 in Segre 1993: 289.

[87] Sherwin-White 1978: 315 and also 111-2.

[88] Ibid., 315-6.

[89] Wilson 2000: 290-2, Le Guen 2001b: 276, and Csapo and Wilson 2015: 353. For the Alexandreia festival see Habicht 1956: 26-8.

[90] E.g. Diod. Sic. 20.98.6-8, Plut. *Mor*. 737c.

[91] In a forthcoming chapter, Thomas Coward reviews the evidence both literary and epigraphic for the performance and composition of poetry across various genres in Hellenistic Rhodes. He also notes that there are many Rhodian actors and musicians winning competitions at home and abroad.

[92] See Gabrielsen 1997: 33-6 and Berthold 1984: 54.

[93] Gabrielsen 1997: 35.

[94] For Rhodes, see Berthold 1984. For Cos, see Sherwin-White 1978: 90-130. However, as Sherwin-White 1978: 93 points out, 'the island's status differed from that of Ptolemaic subject possessions in Asia Minor and the Greek islands. None of the trappings of Ptolemaic authority – governors, garrison and taxation – are attested in Hellenistic Cos.'

[95] Antiph. *Herod*. 77.

[96] E.g. *IG* XII 2, 15, 1.29; *IG* XII, 2, 18, 1.9; cf. Le Guen 2001b: 268.

[97] On Romans in Rhodes, see Hutchinson 2013: 101-8.

[98] The debate about Roman genres deriving from Greek ones – and therefore Latin literature deriving from Greek – is old and extensive. For most recent views, Feeney 2016. For the

specific case of translations or adaptations of Greek drama into Latin, see Schiesaro 2005: 269, Gildenhard 2010: esp. 174-9 and Manuwald 2011: 282-92.

[99] Livy 7.2, Gildenhard 2010: 156-160, Manuwald 2011: 34-7.

[100] Lowe 2008: 85, Manuwald 2011: 22-30, Panayotakis 2010.

[101] Manuwald and Frangoulidis 2016: 3 blame the perception of Greek-style genres as being 'the more elevated and the more important dramatic genres' for the direction and focus of modern research that has devalued other Roman dramatic genres such as *fabula praetexta*, Atellana and mime.

[102] Gildenhard 2010: 157, citing Manuwald 2001. See also Manuwald and Frangoulidis 2016.

[103] Gentili 1979 and Nervegna 2014: 159-160. On the representations of Greek theatrical scenes in South Italy, see Taplin 1993 and 2007, and Revermann 2010. According to Manuwald (2011: 22), Roman tragedies 'seem to have followed classical fifth-century models with a preference for Euripides, whereas Roman comedies relied almost exclusively on Hellenistic models, particularly Menander.' Romans may have also been exposed to Greek theatre as soldiers as they traveled to Sicily during the First Punic War.

[104] E.g. Cic. *Brut*. 71.

[105] Fantham 2002 and Gildenhard 2010: 180. Cf. Cic. *De Opt. gen. or*. 14 and Quint. *Inst.* 1.4.2.

[106] Goldberg 2000: 50.

[107] Manuwald 2011: 41-128.

[108] We must acknowledge the lack of permanent dramatic structures in Republican Rome, since drama was always performed in a temporary wooden structure built for the particular festival in question. In fact, the first permanent theater in Rome was the Theater of Pompey, which was built in 55 BC. See Beacham 1991: 56-85, Jones 1993, Goldberg 1996 and Erasmo 2004: 83-91. Cf. Quint. *Inst*. 11.3.73.

[109] Manuwald 2011: 124. cf. Quint. *Inst*. 11.3.4 and Gell. *NA* 2.23.1-3. Goldberg (1996: 272) blames the popularity of mimes and other public spectacles for audiences' lack of interest in performed tragedy.

[110] The translation is that of H. Rackham (Cicero. *On Ends*, Loeb Classical Library 40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914).

[111] For a wider discussion of this passage, see Erasmo 2004: 1-2.

[112] Tarrant (1985: 14) notes that their text displays 'a lack of concern for theatrical realities.' For a consideration of this thorny issue, see the essays in Harrison 2000.

[113] E.g. essays in Harrison 2000 (esp. the essays by Fitch and Shelton) and Erasmo 2004: 122-139.

[114] Baertschi 2010: 251.

[115] For Sophocles in particular, see Holford-Strevens 1999.

[116] See Wright 1931: 80-93**.**

[117] Gildenhard 2006: 197-9.

[118] Gildenhard 2010: 181.

[119] Goldberg 2000: 52-3.

[120] See also *Rep*. 4.11 and *Tusc*. 2.48

[121] However, he is aware of basics of performance; see Wright 1931: vii and Fantham 2004.

[122] Jocelyn 1973: 71, Gildenhard 2007: 36, Schierl 2015: 50 n. 28. Cf. Lundström 1982: 7 for numbers. He also quotes Roman tragedies in philosophical arguments e.g. Accius' *Medea* and *Atreus* in *Nat. D.* 3.68.

[123] Douglas 1990: 64; cf. Cic. *Fin*. 2.94 which contains some of the same quotations.

[124] *TrGF*^{3} 304-20; this is fr. 193 discussed on pp. 310-313.

[125] Jocelyn 1973: 98 and Douglas 1990:66. In fact the third book on grief contains various further quotations from plays which are otherwise lost: *Tusc*. 3.67 contains five translated

lines from Sophocles' *Phrixus* (*TrGF* F. 821 Nauck), *Tusc*. 3.71 refers to Oileus' change of mind (Sophocles fr. 666 Nauck from unidentified tragedy).

[126] On Ovid, see Curley 2013: 115-21. On Seneca, see Budelmann 2007.

[127] To some extent Cicero is following the model started by Plato and Aristotle; see Gildenhard 2007. On Cicero's taking over quotations from Greek philosophical sources, see Jocelyn 1973: 66, 77 and Spahlinger 2005:13. For a view of the philosophical content of Roman tragedy, see Star 2015.

[128] Green 1994: 145.

[129] Harrison 2013, James 2014.

[130] Bakhtin 1981.

[131] May 2006.

[132] The concluding words of his prologue, *lector intende: laetaberis*, recall prologues of Roman New Comedy, see Mason 1978: 11. See also May 2006 for richness of Apuleius' comic intertexts and inspirations. On mime, see Mason 1978: 10-11

[133] Mason 1978 and 1999.

[134] Tatum 1999.

[135] E.g. Schiesaro 1988 on tragic elements in the Cupid and Psyche novella, May 2006: 250-2 on the old woman as a type of tragic nurse, and May 2006: 307-28 on the *ex machina* elements of Isis' appearance.

[136] The translation is that of J. Arthur Hanson (Apuleius. *Metamorphoses* Books 7-11, Loeb Classical Library 453. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

[137] May 2006: 272-3.

[138] Zwierlein (1987: 55-68) uses this to reconstruct the otherwise lost play by Sophocles.

[139] Zimmerman 2000: 68. Cf. May 2006: 273-4.

[140] Bartsch (1989: 110) notes the language of spectacle and theatre as well as instance of theatre-related words appearing in other prominent places in the narrative.

[141] Morgan 1989 and Pletcher 1998. Hippolytus and Phaedra's story also appears in Xen *Eph*. 2,3; 3.2.

[142] Morgan and Harrison 2008: 225.

[143] Lefteratou 2013: 201.